



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/614,772	07/12/2000	Masaaki Tanizaki	500.38695X00	2414

20457 7590 11/10/2003

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889

EXAMINER

TRAN, QUOC A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/614,772

Applicant(s)

TANIZAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Art Unit

2176

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: original application filed 07/12/2000.
2. Claims 1-7 are currently pending in this application. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on 07/12/2000 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Multiple information disclosure statements may be filed in a single application, and they will be considered, provided each is in compliance with the appropriate requirements of 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98. Use of form PTO-1449, "Information Disclosure Citation," or PTO/SB/08A and 08B, "Information Disclosure Statement," is encouraged as a means to provide the required list of information as set forth in 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1). Applicants are encouraged to use the USPTO forms when preparing an information disclosure statement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2176

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "...the outline" in line 4, page 22. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 2 recites the limitations "...the form" in line 22, "...the type" in line 23, page 22. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "...the lowermost layer" in line 27, page 22. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 4 recites the limitations "...the similarity" in line 5, "...the thickness" in line 6, page 23. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 6 recites the limitations "...the order" in line 13, "...the height" in line 14, page 23. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Dependent claims 5, and 7 are also rejected for fully incorporating the dependencies of their parent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2176

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102b as being unpatentable over Strasnick et al. (hereinafter Strasnick) (US 5,528,735 – filed 03-1993).

5. As to **independent claim 1**, Strasnick discloses a map relationship displaying method (*method and apparatus for displaying data*, Strasnick see col. 1, lines 1-2), comprising the steps of, acquiring server definition data (*establishes a connection with a corporate database server to obtain data*, Strasnick see col. 20, lines 26-27), representing the outline of a server (*data dictionaries*, Strasnick see col. 20, lines 27-28), acquiring application definition data representing the outline of an application (*browsing through the data dictionaries for the available tables, the user identifies the tables containing the data for a sales application*, Strasnick see col. 20, lines 28-29), generating a relationship from said server definition data and said application definition data, displaying a list of said server definition data and a list of said application definition data on display means (*retrieve the required data components from the database and loads them into specified columns in spreadsheet application worksheet*, Strasnick see col. 20, lines 32-34), and deciding the relationship on the basis of a confirmation operation inputted from indication means (*with a graphical query tool, a user performs the necessary queries and operations*, Strasnick see col. 20, lines 31-32).

6. As to **Dependent claim 3**, Strasnick discloses a displaying method where the object hierarchical structure; an object of the lowermost layer and an object of an intermediate layer are distinctively displayed (*nodes are laid out recursively for each level of a partial hierarchy beginning at the bottommost end level of the partial hierarchy*, Strasnick see col. 11, lines 43-45).

7. As to **Dependent claim 4**, Strasnick discloses a displaying method wherein in displaying the object relation-ship, the similarity of the relationship is displayed in a form reflected by the type of line or the thickness of line (*lines between the cells. Connectors represent the contextual relationships between cells ... for example, parents and children*, Strasnick see col. 4, lines 30-33).

8. As to **Dependent claim 5**, Strasnick discloses a displaying method wherein the object relationship is displayed so that child objects of related objects and objects subsequent to the child objects are omitted (*enable a navigator to warp to the hierarchical dependents or children of the cell displayed. The hyperlinks enable a navigator to warp to the siblings of the displayed cell. The hyperlink enables a navigator to warp to the parent of the displayed cell*, Strasnick see col. 8, lines 52-55).

6. As to **Dependent claim 7**, wherein the object hierarchical structure and/or the object relationship are displayed with distinction for each view selected by a user (*a data base system hierarchy ... displayed in the split-screen or*

Art Unit: 2176

multi-screen mode, in which two or more interaction and display panels are displayed simultaneously, Strasnick see col.11, lines 20-30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasnick et al. (hereinafter Strasnick) (US 5,528,735 – filed 03-1993) as applied to claim 1, 3, 4-5, and 7 above, in view of Tesler (hereinafter Tesler) (US 6,577,714 – filed 03-1997).

8. As to **Dependent claim 2, Strasnick does not explicitly teach**, wherein in displaying the object hierarchical structure, the form of display is changed depending on the type of a parent/child relationship between objects. However, **Tesler discloses**, *(Parent nodes in the bottom level of the partial hierarchy can have segments of connection lines extending toward child nodes not included in the partial hierarchy ... is generated and stored. Each partial hierarchy in the cache ends at a progressively deeper level, Tesler see col.8, line 44-46).*

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the partial hierarchy such that parent nodes Parent nodes in the bottom level of the partial hierarchy can have segments of connection lines extending toward child nodes not included in the partial hierarchy, which is generated and stored. Each partial hierarchy in the cache ends at a progressively deeper level of Tesler to hierarchical tree structure of Strasnick. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this functionality, because it would enable (hierarchy manager makes a determination on whether interpolation is necessary, Tesler see col.13, lines 51-54).

9. As to **Dependent claim 6, Strasnick does not explicitly teach**, wherein the object relationship is displayed in the order of a degree of certainty representing the height of degree of association between objects. However, **Tesler discloses** (*normalize heights Option lets a user normalize heights across each level of the hierarchy or across all levels*, Tesler see col. 27, lines 57-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the normalize heights option of Tesler with Strasnick method and apparatus of displaying data. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification, so that (normalizing across each level will independently normalize each level of the hierarchy. This option is most useful if data has been summed up the hierarchy, and prevents the top level of the

Art Unit: 2176

hierarchy from dwarfing items at the lowest level, Tesler see col. 27-28, lines 65-66, lines 1-3)

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Tamano et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,857,199	issued	01-1999
Ellenby	U.S. Patent No. 6,173,239	issued	01-2001
Darcie et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,577,714	issued	06-2003

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-8781. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Feild Joseph can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER